

REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Office action dated August 28, 2006 and have amended the application to more clearly set forth the invention. Claims 1, 3, 11, 23, 25, and 27 have been amended, claims 6 and 26 have been cancelled, and new claims 28-32 have been added by this Amendment C. Thus, claims 1-17 and 23-32 are presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Specification

As suggested by the Examiner, the Amendments to Specification section included in Amendment A filed on February 28, 2006 inadvertently requested replacement of paragraph [0077] instead of paragraph [0074]. As such, applicants request that the Examiner reinstate original paragraph [0077] as filed, if necessary, and request that paragraph [0074] of the specification be amended as shown above.

Claim Objections

Applicants have amended claims 25 and 27 as suggested by the Examiner to correct minor informalities in the claims. In particular, applicants have replaced the terms "impedance of the when" in line 5 of claim 25 with "impedance of the track when." Applicants have also replaced the terms "first signal" in line 3 of claim 27 with "second signal" As such, applicants request that objections to claims 25 and 27 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 3 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Office asserts "the DSP" in claim 3 lacks antecedent basis. Applicants have amended claim 3 to depend from claim 2, rather than claim 1. As such "the DSP" recited in amended claim 3 has proper antecedent basis as claim 2 recites, in part, "wherein the processor is a digital signaling processor (DSP)." With respect to claim 11, the Office asserts the claimed "a first signal processor" and the claimed "second signal processor" in claim 11 is ambiguous because it is not clear if either the first or the second signal

processor is should be the signal processor taught in claim1 or if both the first and second signal processors should be different processors. Applicants have amended claim 11 to recite, in part, "wherein the processor processing the first digital signals is a first digital signaling processor, and further including a second digital signaling processor for processing the second digital signals." Applicants submits that it is now clear that first and second signal processors are different processors.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that amended claims 3 and 11 are in compliance with the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-5, 7, 23-25 as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,581,700 to Farnham et al, and has rejected claims 8 and 9 as being obvious in view of the combination of Farnham and U.S. Patent No. 4,107,616 to Moorey. However, the Examiner acknowledges that claims 6, 10-17 and 26 contain allowable subject matter, and that they would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As such applicants have amended claim 1 to include all the limitations of allowable claim 6, and have amended claim 23 to include all the limitations of allowable claim 26. As such applicants submit that amended claims 1 and 23 are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-5 and 7-17 depend from claim 1, and claims 24, 25, and 27 depend from claim 26 and are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which they depend.

Furthermore, the Examiner has withdrawn the restriction requirement applied to claims 18-22, which were previously canceled, and has authorized the reinstatement of claims 18-22 by renumbering as new claims 28-32.

It is felt that a full and complete response has been made to the Office action, and applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-17 and 23-32 are allowable over the cited art and that the subject application is now in condition for allowance.

The Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the claims as amended to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited

and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the claims in condition for allowance.

Applicants do not believe that a fee is due in connection with this response. If, however, the Commissioner determines that a fee is due, he is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 07-0846.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank R. Agovino/

Frank R. Agovino, Reg. No. 27,416
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

FRA/caa